

JUN-24-2005 FRI 10:00 AM LACASSE AND ASSOCIATES

FAX NO. 7038387684

P. 06

FUJS 18.150
09/751,974

In the Drawings:

None

FUJS 18.150
09/751,974REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action dated 2/24/2005 and further in view of the interview of 6/17/2005. Applicants are appreciative of the professional and courteous interview held with the examiner. During the interview, applicants' representative pointed out many of the limitations not provided for by applicants' admitted prior art. Based on arguments presented during the interview (many of which are repeated herein), the examiner appeared to have gained a better understanding of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 19 and appeared to agree that the limitations of the determining section, the event determining section, and the call-number changing section were neither anticipated nor rendered obvious given applicants' admitted prior art. The Applicants are also appreciative for the recognized allowable subject matter.

Minor amendments are made to claims 7-9 and 25-27 to correct typographical errors without adding new matter. Claims 29 and 30 have been withdrawn from consideration via the current amendment. This response should obviate outstanding issues and make the remaining claims allowable. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the interview of 6/17/2005 and the remarks that follow.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claims 2-18 and 20-28 are allowed.

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's admitted prior art.

Claims 29 and 30 have been withdrawn via the current amendment.

FUJS 18,150
09/751,974

OVERVIEW OF CLAIMED INVENTION

The presently claimed invention provides for a mobile-service switching center in a switching center system including a plurality of first multicall communication mode supporting terminals (capable of supporting a plurality of calls at a time) and a plurality of single-call communication mode supporting terminals (capable of supporting only a single call at a time), wherein the mobile-service switching center comprises a determining section, event detecting section, and a call-number changing section. The determining section determines whether a call request is a call from the first multicall communication mode supporting terminal or from the single-call communication mode supporting terminal. The event detecting section detects an event caused by a handover occurrence or fluctuation of a congested state of a network, by a reception of a handover requesting signal, or an increase of a load representing the congested state of the network. The call-number changing section increases or decreases to change the number of continuing calls of the first multicall communication mode supporting terminal which is determined by the determining section, when an event is detected by the event detecting section it detects any event during the communication.

In one embodiment, if the current maintained communications mode is requested to change into a single call communication mode or current settled number of calls are requested to reduce a number of calls less than the current continued number due to a change of communication environment, the present invention's network management side informs the subscriber of the requested change or the requested reduction of call-numbers so as to make the subscriber change the number of calls, or the network management side manages the relative

FUJS 18.150
09/751,974

priority of calls for each of the plurality of calls continued by the subscriber so as to make the subscriber select a desired call.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicants' admitted prior art. To be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), the single cited reference (or in this case the reference to applicants' admitted prior art) must teach all the limitations of the rejected claims. Applicants contend that applicants' admitted prior art neither anticipates nor renders obvious many of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 19.

Figures 29 and 30 of the application-as-filed describe the prior art. Specifically, figure 29 describes an example connection sequence of a "catch" phone, wherein a call is temporarily held at the switching center and the communication line settled between the mobile terminal and the switching center is not more than a single line. Figure 30 describes an example connection sequence of a multi-session (multicall) phone, wherein a plural number of communication lines are settled between a mobile terminal and the switching center.

On page 2 of the office action, the examiner cites page 5, lines 23-page 6, line 2 of the application-as-filed as anticipating the limitation of the determining section of independent claims 1 and 19. A closer reading of the citation, however, merely reveals how, during network congestion, in conventional multicall communication mode technology, the network side arbitrarily selects a call to be continued, while discarding others. Conspicuously absent in the citation, or the prior art in general, is a teaching or suggestion for a mobile-service switching center that determines if a call request from a multicall communication mode supporting terminal

FUJS 18.150
09/751,974

or a single-call communication mode supporting terminal. Applicants contend that the prior art mobile switching center lack the ability to discriminate between a multicall communication mode supporting terminal and a single-call communication mode supporting terminal. Hence, applicants' admitted prior art cannot anticipate or render obvious the limitation of the determining section, as per claims 1 and 19.

Additionally, on page 2 of the office action, the examiner cites page 5, lines 6-16 of the application-as-filed as anticipating the limitation of the event detecting section as per claims 1 and 19. A closer reading of the citation merely reveals how handover is performed in mobile communications system. However, conspicuously absent in the citation, or the prior art in general, is a teaching or suggestion for the detection of an event caused by a handover occurrence (i.e., by a reception of a handover requesting signal) or a fluctuation in the congested state of a network (i.e., an increase in the load representing the congested state of a network). Hence, applicants' admitted prior art cannot anticipate or render obvious the limitation of the event detecting section, as per claims 1 and 19.

Further, on pages 2-3 of the office action, the examiner cites page 6, lines 3-13 of the application-as-filed as anticipating the limitation of the call-number changing section as per claims 1 and 19. A closer reading of the citation merely reveals how, during a state of congestion, the prior art switching center automatically selects calls of higher priority over calls of lower priority. However, conspicuously absent in the citation, or the prior art in general, is a teaching or suggestion for increasing or decreasing (to change) the number of continuing calls of a multicall communication mode supporting terminal, which is determined by the determining section, when an event is detected by the event detecting section it detects any event during the

FUJS 18.150
09/751,974

communication. Hence, applicants' admitted prior art cannot anticipate or render obvious the limitation of the call number changing section, as per claims 1 and 19.

Hence, as applicants' admitted prior art fails to either anticipate or render obvious many of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 19, applicants respectfully request the examiner to withdraw the rejections with respect to independent claims 1 and 19.

SUMMARY

As has been detailed above, none of the references, cited or applied, provide for the specific claimed details of applicant's presently claimed invention, nor renders them obvious. It is believed that this case is in condition for allowance and reconsideration thereof and early issuance is respectfully requested.

This amendment is being filed with a petition for extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the petition fee, as well as any deficiencies in the fees provided to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

F0JS 18.150
09/751,974

If it is felt that an interview would expedite prosecution of this application, please do not hesitate to contact applicant's representative at the below number.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Registration No. 46947

Katten Muchin Roseman LLP
575 Madison Ave
New York, NY 10022
212-940-8800
June 23, 2005